arXiv:1007.3969v1 [math-ph] 22 Jul 2010

Affine Constellations Without Mutually Unbiased Counterparts

Stefan Weigert[▽] and Thomas Durt[△]

July 23, 2010

[▽]Department of Mathematics, University of York, UK-York YO10 5DD
[△]IR-TONA, VUB, BE-1050 Brussels

slow500@york.ac.uk, thomdurt@vub.ac.be

Abstract

It has been conjectured that a complete set of mutually unbiased bases in a space of dimension d exists if and only if there is an affine plane of order d. We introduce *affine constellations* and compare their existence properties with those of mutually unbiased constellations. The observed discrepancies make a deeper relation between the two existence problems unlikely.

Two orthonormal bases B and $B^{'}$ of a d-level quantum system are *mutually unbiased* (MU) if $|\langle b|b^{'}\rangle|^2 = 1/d$ for any two states $|b\rangle \in B$ and $|b^{'}\rangle \in B^{'}$. This means that the probabilities for a transition of a quantum system prepared in the state $|b\rangle \in B$ into a state $|b^{'}\rangle \in B^{'}$ are independent of both the initital and the final state [1].

It is known how to construct *triples* of MU bases in $\mathbb{C}^d$ for all values of $d \geq 2$ [2]. The construction of $(d+1)$-tuples of MU bases [3, 4, 5] can be based on Galois number fields or, alternatively, on fundamental number-theoretical identities both of which, however, only exist if the number d is a prime or a power of a prime. Since the state space $\mathbb{C}^d$ of a d-level quantum system acccomodates at most $(d+1)$ MU bases, the question of how many MU bases exist in spaces of *composite* dimension such as $d = 6, 10, 12, \ldots$ arises naturally. While it seems unlikely that composite dimensions support *complete* sets of MU bases, no definite answer has yet been found. Spaces of composite dimension appear to be "more generic" (or "less special") than those of prime or prime power dimension—the known constructions of complete sets of MU bases (see [6] for a review) are based on mathematical structures existing for prime (power) dimensions only.

In dimension six, extensive numerical studies [7, 8] support the view that certain subsets of $(d+1)$-tuples of MU bases, known as *MU constellations*, do not exist. Clearly, if a complete set of seven MU bases were to exist in $\mathbb{C}^6$, then any MU constellation obtained by removing some of these $d(d+1)$ vectors would exist as well. Consider, for example, the MU constellation $\{5,5,3,1\}_6$ ($\equiv \{5^2,3,1\}_6$). It consists of four sets of *orthonormal* vectors in $\mathbb{C}^6$ containing $5, 5, 3,$ and 1 elements, respectively, and the squared modulus of the scalar product between vectors taken from *different* sets equals $1/6$. While this MU constellation of 14 vectors has been identified by numerical searches, other MU constellations with the same number of vectors such as $\{5,4,3,2\}_6$ or $\{5,3^3\}_6$ have not been found, in spite of numerical efforts considerably larger than those needed to identify $\{5^2,3,1\}_6$.

In an attempt to get a handle on the existence problem for complete MU bases, it is natural to search for existence problems similar in spirit. A promising candidate are *finite affine planes* [9]: these geometric structures consist of a finite number of *points* which satisfy the following postulates: (i) any two points determine a unique line; (ii) given a line and a further point, there is a unique line through this point disjoint from the given line. Trivial realizations of finite affine planes are excluded by the requirement that (iii) there exist four points such that no three of them are located on a single line. The *order* d of an affine plane is given by the number of points on each line, and the entire plane can be *foliated*[1] into d parallel (i.e. non-intersecting) lines in $(d+1)$ different ways.

Affine planes are readily constructed in terms of Galois fields if their order d is a prime number or a prime power [10], in striking analogy to the known constructions of MU bases [11]. The Bruck-Ryser theorem [12] shows that affine planes of specific composite orders, $d = 6, 14, 21, \ldots$, do not exist, and computer-aided combinatorics rule out the existence of an affine plane of order 10 [13].

The possibility of a link between the existence problems for MU bases and affine planes has been voiced repeatedly [14, 15], with Wootters suggesting the explicit correspondence [10, 16] that *parallel lines of an affine plane should correspond to operators projecting on orthogonal quantum states*. Consequently, foliations are associated with orthonormal bases. Saniga, Planat, and Rosu [17] have elevated the link between MU bases and affine planes to a conjecture:

> *"Non-existence of a projective plane of the given order d implies that there are less than $d+1$ mutually unbiased bases (MUBs) in the corresponding $\mathcal{H}^d$,* and vice versa."

A *projective* plane of order d turns into an affine plane of the same order if

[1] A foliation is also know as a *striation*, or as a *pencil* in the mathematical literature.

one line is discarded[2], thus covering the original claim.

In this note, we will investigate the relation between MU bases and affine planes in the light of MU constellations. Our observations will suggest that the two existence problems actually exhibit *less* structural similarity (at least in dimension six) than one would hope for on the basis of the SPR-conjecture.

Let us introduce the main concept needed for our argument, defined in analogy to MU constellations: an *affine constellation* $\langle x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_d \rangle_d$ of order d consists of $(d+1)$ sets of $x_b \in \{0, 1, \ldots, d-1\}$ lines with d points each such that (a) any two lines within each set do not intersect and (b) any two lines from different sets have exactly one point in common. This notion is easily understood by example. Given an affine plane of order $d = 3$, there are four different ways to arrange all nine points on three non-intersecting (parallel) lines. Ignoring, say, seven of these twelve lines (one foliation, two lines of the second foliation and one each of the remaining two), we create the affine constellation $\langle 2^2, 1 \rangle_3$ ($\equiv \langle 2, 2, 1 \rangle_3$). It consists of three sets of $2, 2,$ and 1 lines, respectively, such that the lines within each set indeed have (a) no point in common while (b) lines belonging to different sets share exactly one point.

Clearly, if an affine plane of order d exists, all affine constellations obtained by removing one line or more also exist. If, however, for a given value of d, some affine constellation is found *not* to exist, then an affine plane of order d cannot exist. Assuming that the SPR-conjecture captures a fundamental mathematical relationship between MU bases and affine planes, one would expect the properties of affine constellations to closely parallel those of MU constellations.

In prime power dimensions, parallel lines of an affine plane can be associated successfully with operators projecting on orthogonal quantum states. We now turn to the question whether this correspondence continues to hold for affine constellations, especially in composite dimensions such as $d = 6$.

Let us begin with a few encouraging observations. A first important property of orthonormal bases of $\mathbb{C}^d$ does have an analogue for affine planes: there is only one way to complete $(d-1)$ orthonormal vectors of $\mathbb{C}^d$ into a basis[3] just as there is a unique line parallel to $(d-1)$ non-intersecting lines of an affine plane[4] of order d. Second, this last line is easily seen to intersect only once with any other line which has only one point in common with

[2]Conversely, an affine plane of order d can be promoted to a projective plane of the same order.

[3]This is the reason for listing only $(d-1)$ states in a MU constellation: $\{5^3\}_6$, for example, denotes three MU bases in dimension six, containing six vectors each, although only 15 vectors are exhibited.

[4]Thus, we will also limit the number of lines necessary to specify an affine constellation to $(d-1)$, so that $\langle 2^4 \rangle_3$ denotes the affine plane of order three.

each of the $(d-1)$ given lines. In the context of MU constellations, this means that the d^{th} line is automatically MU to all states which are MU to the original $(d-1)$ states. Finally, given d different foliations of d^2 points by d lines, a $(d+1)^{st}$ foliation must exist ([18], stated without proof[5]) promoting the affine constellation $\langle (d-1)^d \rangle_d$ to the affine plane $\langle (d-1)^{d+1} \rangle_d$. An analogous property holds for MU constellations: given d MU bases, a *complete* set of $(d+1)$ MU bases $\{(d-1)^{d+1}\}_d$ can be constructed [18]. Here the similarities end.

We now come to the main point of this note:

> *MU constellations and affine constellations do not match in dimension six.*

To see this, let us consider 36 points which are known not to support an affine plane of order six—the maximal number of foliations is three, not seven [19]. The largest possible affine constellation (containing three foliations) is given by $\langle 5^3, 4 \rangle_6$ since adding a fifth line to the last four would imply the existence of *four* foliations, a contradiction. This constellation exists: two (standard) foliations of $\langle 5^3, 4 \rangle_6$ are given by the six horizontal and six vertical lines, and Table 1 makes the remaining ten lines explicit using the notation of a *Graeco-Latin square* for a pair of *mutually orthogonal Latin squares*, or MOLS [9] (see the caption for details).

Now, a valid association of lines in an affine constellation with projection operators acting in $\mathbb{C}^6$ would suggest the existence of the MU constellation $\{5^3, 4\}_6$. However, as mentioned before, there is strong evidence for the *non-existence* of the MU constellations $\{5, 4, 3, 2\}$ and $\{5^3, 3\}_6$ which imply the non-existence of $\{5^3, 4\}_6$ – and, *a fortiori*, of any MU constellation "in between" since MU constellations form a *lattice* [8]. Thus, while Table 1 explicitly exhibits the affine constellation $\langle 5^3, 4 \rangle_6$, its MU counterpart is unlikely to exist. This is our main result, and it casts doubt on the (attractive) idea of a deeper structural relation between affine constellations and MU constellations.

Let us point out further mismatches in dimension six:

- The MU constellation $\{5^3\}_6$ consisting of three MU bases related to the Heisenberg-Weyl group cannot be extended by a single MU vector [2]. Thus, it is impossible to associate any of the four lines in the

[5] Given the affine constellation $\langle (d-1)^d \rangle_d$, consider those d lines of the d foliations of the d^2 points that pass through an arbitrary point P. There remain $d-1 = d^2 - (d(d-1)+1)$ points that do not belong to those lines. The union of these $d-1$ points with the point P defines a line L_P. Repeating this construction with a different point P' we obtain a line $L_{P'}$ which either coincides with L_P (if P' belongs to L_P) or is parallel to L_P (if P' is not on L_P). Ultimately, we end up with a new foliation consisting of d distinct, parallel lines each of which, by construction, intersects any line of $\langle (d-1)^d \rangle_d$ in only one point. Adding this foliation to the initial affine constellation, you obtain an affine plane $\langle (d-1)^{d+1} \rangle_d$ of dimension d since the postulates (i) to (iii) are satisfied.

54	2·	3·	63	11	42
1·	53	64	4·	22	31
2·	62	51	3·	44	13
61	1·	4·	52	33	24
32	41	23	14	5·	6·
43	34	12	21	6·	5·

Table 1: This (incomplete) Graeco-Latin square represents one foliation and four additional lines of $\langle 5^3, 4\rangle_6$, the maximal affine constellation of order 6. The first integer in each square indicates one of the six lines of the (non-standard) foliation to which the corresponding point belongs. These integers are different in each row and column ensuring that each line has only one point in common with the standard foliations consisting of horizontal and vertical lines, respectively. Four more lines are defined by the second integers which, again, they do not repeat within any line or column. Finally, no two squares contain the same two-digit number to ensure that each of the four lines intersects those of the third foliation in a single point only.

affine constellation $\langle 5^3, 4\rangle_6$ with such a vector once the three foliations have been mapped to three Heisenberg-Weyl type MU bases (cf. [20] for a similar argument in dimension 10).

- The columns of the unit matrix and the *special* (or Tao's) matrix define two MU bases which have been shown to be unextendible by two orthonormal MU vectors, that is, to the MU constellation $\{5^2, 2\}_6$ [21]. In contrast, nothing prevents us from extending any two foliations of 36 points by two lines to obtain the affine constellation $\langle 5^2, 2\rangle_6$.

- The unit matrix and the matrices of the Fourier family [22] provide a two-parameter set of inequivalent MU constellations $\{5^2\}_6$. However, a discrete set of 36 points cannot support *continuous* families of affine constellations $\langle 5^2\rangle_6$.

Similar disparities also arise for constellations in prime and prime powers. Suffice it to recall that for $d = 4$ the set of triples of MU bases depends on three continuous parameters [23] and again, there is no room for continuous families of affine constellations.

Strictly speaking, these mismatches between affine and MU constellations do not directly affect the SPR-conjecture since it only relates *complete* sets of MU bases to finite projective (and hence affine) planes, i.e *maximal* affine constellations. Nevertheless, the conjecture is mathematically considerably less attractive if its natural extension to constellations does not hold. We feel that the discrepancies just described indicate the absence of a

deeper structural similarity between the two existence problems.[6]

These observations clearly leave room for alternative links between affine and MU constellations. It would be interesting, for example, to establish a weaker correspondence between *foliations* of d^2 points and MU bases in $\mathbb{C}^d$ for composite dimensions $d = \Pi_n p_n^{k_n}$ (with prime numbers p_n, positive integers k_n, and increasing factors $p_n^{k_n}$). Any such correspondence would need to accomodate a number of known facts. There exist $(p_1^{k_1} - 1)$ MOLS, [24, 9], giving rise to $(p_1^{k_1} + 1)$ foliations from which one may construct $(p_1^{k_1} + 1)$ MU bases [25]. In infinitely many *square* dimensions *more* MU bases can be found [26]: for example, four MOLS in dimension $d = 2^2 \cdot 13^2$ translate into *six* MU bases. Interestingly, a particular construction of MU bases via MOLS which works for prime power dimensions *fails* in composite dimensions such as $d = 10$ [20]. Furthermore, our observations suggest that the correspondence might not be one-to-one in some cases. The situation is complicated even further if one considers sets of *triples* of MU bases in low dimensions: for $d = 3$, there is only *one* triple of MU bases; for $d = 4$, there is a *three-parameter family* of MU triples; and for $d = 5$, there is a *pair* of MU triples [21].

In summary, we feel that the observed structural discrepancies result from the fact that state space of affine constellations is *finite* while Hilbert space, the habitat of MU bases, has room for families of states depending on *continuous parameters*. Simply enumerating all possible candidates of lines allows one to confirm the non-existence of an affine plane *par épuisement* (which, in fact, lead to the first proof that there is no affine plane in dimension six [19]). Similarly, the computer-aided exhaustive enumeration of a *finite* number of cases plays an important role in disproving the existence of an affine plane of order 10.

It is true that promising approaches to prove the non-existence of complete sets of MU bases reduce the problem to an *algorithmic* one such that only a finite number of cases need to be checked [27, 28]. However, this does not take away anything from the fundamental difference between the state spaces of the two problems which, in our view, speaks against the SPR-conjecture capturing a deep mathematical truth.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank H. Zainuddin for his hospitality during EQuaLS 3, where this work was initiated, and I. Bengtsson, S. Brierley, and T. Sudbery for constructive comments on early drafts.

[6] The Bruck-Ryser theorem, establishing the non-existence of finite affine planes in specific composite dimensions, is a case in point: closer inspection of the proof shows that it relies on entries of certain matrices to take values of 0 and 1 only while the elements of Hadamard matrices, their equivalent in the setting of MU bases, are complex numbers of modulus one.

References

[1] J. Schwinger: Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U.S.A., **46**, 560 (1960)

[2] M. Grassl: *On SIC-POVMs and MUBs in Dimension 6*, in: *Proc. ERATO Conference on Quantum Information Science (EQUIS 2004)*, J. Gruska (ed.)

[3] I. D. Ivanović: J. Phys. A **14**, 3241 (1981)

[4] W.K. Wootters and B. D. Fields: Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **191**, 363 (1989)

[5] S. Bandyopadhyay, P.O. Boykin, V. Roychowdhury and F. Vatan: Algorithmica, **34**, 512 (2002)

[6] T. Durt, B.-G. Englert, I. Bengtsson, and K. Życzkowski: *On Mutually Unbiased Bases*, arXiv:1004:3348

[7] P. Butterley and W. Hall: Phys. Lett. A **369**, 5 (2007)

[8] S. Brierley and S. Weigert: Phys. Rev. A **78**, 042312 (2008)

[9] M.K. Bennet: *Affine and Projective Geometry*, Wiley, New York 1995

[10] W.K. Wootters: IBM J. Res. Dev. **48**, 99 (2004)

[11] T. Durt: J. Phys. A **38**, 5267 (2005)

[12] R.H. Bruck and H.J. Ryser: Can. J. Math. **1**, 88 (1949)

[13] C.W.H. Lam, L. Thiel, and S. Swiercz: Canad. J. Math. **41**, 1117 (1989)

[14] G. Zauner: *Quantendesigns. Grundzüge einer nichtkommutativen Designtheorie.* PhD thesis, University of Wien, 1999.

[15] I. Bengtsson and Å. Ericsson: Open Sys. Inf. Dyn. **12**, 1230 (2005)

[16] W.K. Wootters: Found. Phys. **36**, 112 (2006)

[17] M. Saniga, M. Planat, and H. Rosu: J. Opt. B: Quantum Semiclass. **6**, L19 (2004)

[18] M. Weiner: *A gap for the maximum number of mutually unbiased bases*, arXiv:0902.0635

[19] G. Tarry: C. R. Ass. Fr. Av. Sci. Nat.**1**, 122 and 2170 (1900)

[20] T. Paterek, M. Pawlowski, M. Grassl, Č. Brukner: *On the connection between mutually unbiased bases and orthogonal Latin squares*, arXiv:0910.1439

[21] S. Brierley, S. Weigert, and I. Bengtsson: *All Mutually Unbiased Bases in Dimensions Two to Five*, J. Quant. Inf. Comp. (in press)

[22] *On-line catalogue of known Hadamard matrices* maintained by W. Tadej and K. Życzkowski at `http://chaos.if.uj.edu.pl/~karol/hadamard/`

[23] S. Brierley and S. Weigert: Phys. Rev. A **79**, 052316 (2009)

[24] H.F. MacNeish: Ann. Math. **23**, 221 (1921)

[25] T. Paterek, B. Dakić, Č. Brukner: Phys. Rev. A**79**, 012109 (2009)

[26] P. Wocjan and T. Beth: Quant. Inf. Comp. **5**, 93 (2005)

[27] P. Jaming, M. Matolcsi, P. Móra, F. Szöllősi and M. Weiner: J. Phys. A: **42**, 245305 (2009)

[28] S. Brierley and S. Weigert: *Mutually Unbiased Bases and Semi-definite Programming*, arXiv:1006.0093